

ON THE JEWISH RELIGION AND QUOTES FROM THE TALMUD

The Jews are a uniquely evil and cancerous force in this world. They have been exposed and expelled in every generation somewhere on the Earth which has the misfortune to have them. The problem with expelling them is that they always come back and people seem to forget why they were expelled in the first place. Edward the first kicked them out of England and it took 360 years for them to return. Menasseh Ben Israel preyed upon Cromwell's arrogance and flawed theology- "Jesus can't come back until the Jews are in all nations and convert and who else can convert us but the most Christian nation on the planet, England!" The Jews love to use our own pride and lowest natures against us and warping Christian theology is nothing new for them!

It certainly feels like today we are on the precipice of exposing and expelling the Jews yet again. There are more and more Jew namers out there and people are noticing like never before. Unfortunately some of our ammunition is old and not fit for service. Our movement is still using reprints of supposed Talmudic quotes from the 60s- typos and all! Some of the quotes are outright fraudulent and many are not part of the Talmud at all, though they are important to the Jewish religion. If we try to expose the teachings of the Jews and are wrong about a major quote the Jews are going to latch upon it and the person receiving the information will dismiss it as propaganda. I've seen exactly that on internet forums.

Our ammunition needs to be updated, we can't afford misfires in the heat of battle. A common claim is that we take the quotes out of context. I went through the various quotes we commonly find. Many are paraphrases of what the books actually say and some are not fairly paraphrased (like the common passage about using a non Jewish woman like a piece of meat is actually about how Jews can use their women as a piece of meat). The following is a list of the quotes which are legitimate with much of the passage for context. Every quote is word for word from Jewish sources available for free on the internet. They truly are a sick people.

TALMUD (The William Davidson Talmud unless otherwise noted, the Davidson adds "clarification" not in the Hebrew text which the German translation by Lazarus Goldschmidt does not provide so occasionally a translation of the German edition is provided)

Sanhedrin 52b (22) GEMARA: The Sages taught: The verse states: "And a man who commits adultery with another man's wife, even he who commits adultery with his neighbor's wife, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death" (Leviticus 20:10). The term: "A man," is interpreted as excluding a minor boy who committed adultery before he came of age. The phrase: "Who commits adultery with another man's wife," is interpreted as excluding the wife of a minor boy; marriage to a minor is not considered halakhic marriage. "His neighbor's wife" excludes the wife of another, i.e., a gentile, who is not referred to as "his neighbor."

Sanhedrin 54b (17) The Sages taught: With regard to intercourse with a male, the Torah does not deem a younger boy to be like an older boy; but with regard to intercourse with an animal, the Torah does deem a young animal to be like an old animal. (18) The Gemara asks: What does it mean that the Torah does not deem a younger boy to be like an older boy? Rav says: It means that the Torah does not deem the intercourse of one who is less than nine years old to be like the intercourse of one who is at least nine years old, as for a male's act of intercourse to have the legal status of full-fledged intercourse the minimum age is nine years. And Shmuel says: The Torah does not deem the intercourse of a child who is less than three years old to be like that of one who is three years old. (19) The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do Rav and Shmuel disagree? The Gemara answers: Rav holds that any halakha that applies to one who engages in intercourse actively applies to one who engages in intercourse passively, and any halakha that does not apply to one who engages in intercourse actively does not apply to one who engages in intercourse passively. (20) Therefore, just as one who engages in intercourse actively is not liable if he is less than nine years old, as the intercourse of such a child does not have the halakhic status of intercourse, so too, if a child who is less than nine years old engages in homosexual intercourse passively, the one who engages in intercourse with him is not liable. And Shmuel holds: It is written: "And you shall not lie with a male as with a woman," indicating that the halakha of a male who engages in intercourse passively is like that of a woman; just as the intercourse of a woman has the halakhic status of intercourse from when she is three years old, the same is true with regard to a male who engages in intercourse passively. (21) Consequently, in Shmuel's opinion, one who engages in intercourse with a male who is older than three is liable. It is taught in a baraita in accordance with the opinion of Rav: One who engages in homosexual intercourse with a male aged nine years and one day, 55a (1) or one who engages in intercourse with an animal, whether in a typical manner or in an atypical manner, i.e., anal intercourse, and similarly a woman who engages in intercourse with an animal, whether in a typical manner or in an atypical manner, is liable. This baraita sets the minimum age for the passive male at nine years and one day. (2) Rav Nahman bar Rav Hisda taught: With regard to a woman there are two manners of lying. A woman who engages in intercourse with an animal, whether it is vaginal or anal intercourse, is liable. But with regard to a man who engages in intercourse with an animal there is only one manner of lying, i.e., vaginal intercourse. (3) Rav Pappa objects to this opinion: On the contrary, a woman, whose typical manner of intercourse is vaginal, is rendered liable for lying with an animal only in that manner; she is not rendered liable for something else, i.e., for engaging in anal intercourse with an animal. With regard to a man who engages in intercourse with an animal, by contrast, since it is not its typical conduct to engage in intercourse with a man, he should be rendered liable for engaging in intercourse with it through each and every orifice.

Sanhedrin 58b (17) Rabbi Hanina says: A gentile who struck a Jew is liable to receive the death penalty, as it is stated when Moses saw an Egyptian striking a Hebrew: "And he turned this way and that way, and when he saw that there was no man, he struck the Egyptian and hid him in the sand" (Exodus 2:12). (18) And Rabbi Hanina says: One who slaps the cheek of a Jew is considered as though he slapped the cheek of the Divine Presence; as it is stated: "It is a snare [mokesh] for a man to rashly say [yala]: Holy" (Proverbs 20:25). The verse is interpreted homiletically to mean: One who strikes [nokesh] a Jew is considered as though he hurt the cheek [lo'a] of the Holy One.

Sanhedrin 57a (15) Because the tanna wanted to teach in the latter clause that if a Jew does so to a gentile, it is permitted, he taught in the former clause that if a gentile does one of these, it is prohibited. If the baraita were to state that if a gentile does so, he is liable, it would have to state that if a Jew does so to a gentile, he is exempt, because this is the opposite of liable. That would indicate that it is actually prohibited for a Jew to do so to a gentile, and that he is merely exempt from liability, which is not the case. Therefore, the word prohibited is used with regard to a gentile. Therefore, this does not prove that a gentile is exempt from capital punishment.[the German translation by Lazarus Goldschmidt simply says: Since in the final sentence he wants to teach that it is permissible for an Israelite to do this to a non-Jew, he teaches in the first sentence that it is forbidden.] (16) The Gemara challenges: But wherever there is liability for capital punishment, this tanna teaches it; as it is taught in the first clause: With regard to bloodshed, if a gentile murders another gentile, or a gentile murders a Jew, he is liable. If a Jew murders a gentile, he is exempt. Evidently, the term liable is used in the baraita. (17) The Gemara answers: There, in that case, how should the tanna teach it? Should he teach it using the terms prohibited and permitted, indicating that a Jew may kill a gentile ab initio? But isn't it taught in a baraita that with regard to a gentile, and likewise with regard to Jewish shepherds of small livestock, who were typically robbers, one may not raise them out of a pit into which they fell, and one may not lower them into a pit? In other words, one may not rescue them from danger, but neither may one kill them ab initio. With regard to robbery, the term permitted is relevant, as it is permitted for a Jew to rob a gentile. [German: How could he teach otherwise: if, for example, it is 'forbidden' or 'permitted', then it is taught that non-Jews and shepherds of small livestock should neither be brought up nor cast down.] (18) The Gemara returns to discuss the details of the prohibition of robbery mentioned in the baraita, which included actions similar to it. The Gemara asks: With regard to robbery, to what actions similar to it is the baraita referring? Rav Aha bar Ya'akov says: It is necessary only to teach the halakha of a laborer working in a vineyard who eats from the fruit of the vineyard; his action is similar to robbery, and it is prohibited for a gentile to do so. (19) The Gemara asks: When does this laborer in a vineyard eat from the fruit? If he does so at the time of the completion of the work, i.e., while he is harvesting the fruit, it is permitted for him to do so, just as a Jew working for another Jew is allowed to do so. If it is not at the time of the completion of its work, eating the fruit is full-fledged robbery, and there is no novel element to this case. (20) Rather, Rav Pappa says that the mention in the baraita of actions similar to robbery is necessary only to teach the halakha of one who robs another of less than the value of one peruta. The Gemara asks: If so, why does the baraita state that it is prohibited for a gentile to do so to a Jew? Isn't a Jew apt to forgive such a tiny debt? Why is this considered robbery? The Gemara answers: Although afterward the owner forgives him, does he not incur distress at the time of the robbery? Consequently, at the time of the robbery the robber commits a transgression and is liable to be punished for it. (21) The Gemara challenges: If the mention of actions similar to robbery is referring to the robbery of less than the value of one peruta, what is the novel element in the case of a gentile who robs a gentile? Since they are not apt to grant forgiveness, robbing a gentile of even a minuscule amount is considered full-fledged robbery, and not merely similar to robbery. (22) Rather, Rav Aha, son of Rav Ika, says that there is a different explanation: It is necessary only to teach the halakha of one who withholds the wages of a hired laborer; for a gentile to do so to another gentile and for a gentile to do so to a Jew is prohibited, but for a Jew to do so to a gentile is permitted. This case is less obvious than other types of robbery, as instead of taking an item from the victim, the robber withholds money that is due to the victim. [the German translation reads- Rather, explained R. Aha, son of R. Iqa, this refers to the case of withholding the wages of a hireling; It is forbidden to a non-Jew towards a non-Jew and to a non-Jew towards a Yisraelite; it is permitted to a Yisraelite towards a non-Jew.]

Sanhedrin 59a (2) "And Rabbi Yohanan says: A gentile who engages in Torah study is liable to receive the death penalty; as it is stated: "Moses commanded us a law [torah], an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob" (Deuteronomy 33:4), indicating that it is an inheritance for us, and not for them." (3) The Gemara challenges: But if so, let the tanna count this prohibition among the seven Noahide mitzvot. The Gemara explains: According to the one who says that the verse is referring to the Torah as an inheritance, this prohibition is included in the prohibition of robbery, as a gentile who studies Torah robs the Jewish people of it. According to the one who says that the verse is referring to the Torah as betrothed, as the spelling of the Hebrew word for betrothed [me'orasa], is similar to that of the word for inheritance [morasha], the punishment of a gentile who studies Torah is like that of one who engages in intercourse with a betrothed young woman, which is execution by stoning.

Sanhedrin 76b (2) Rav Yehuda says that Rav says: One who marries his daughter to an old man, and one who takes a wife for his minor son, and one who returns a lost item to a gentile are all individuals who are the cause of sin. Marriage to an old man or a minor leaves the woman unsatisfied and is apt to lead to licentiousness. One who returns lost property to gentiles adds to the property that they stole from Jews. With regard to each of them the verse states: "Lest there should be among you a man or a woman...whose heart turns away this day from the Lord...saying: I will have peace, even though I walk in the stubbornness of my heart, that the quenched shall be added to the thirsty. The Lord will not be willing to pardon him" (Deuteronomy 29:17-19).

Sanhedrin 78b:14 If one intended to kill an animal, and he killed a person standing adjacent to it, or if he intended to kill a gentile, for whose murder he is not liable to be executed in court, and he killed a Jew, or if he intended to kill non-viable newborns, for whose murder one is not liable, and he killed a viable person, the assailant is exempt from execution, since his intent was to kill one for whose murder he is not liable.

Sanhedrin 105a (8) It was taught in a baraita: He is Beor, father of Balaam, he is Cushan-Rishathaim, he is Laban the Aramean. He was called Beor because he engaged in bestiality. He was called Cushan-Rishathaim because he performed two evil deeds [rishiyot] to the Jewish people, one during the time of Jacob, when he pursued him intending to kill him, and one during the time when the judges judged. And what was his actual name? His name was Laban the Aramean.

... (17) The Gemara relates: Balaam was a diviner by using his penis. It is written here: "Fallen, yet with opened eyes"(Numbers 24:4), and it is written there: "And Haman was fallen upon the divan whereupon Esther was" (Esther 7:8), indicating that the verb

fallen has sexual connotations. It was stated that there is an amoraic dispute with regard to this matter. Mar Zutra says: Balaam was a diviner by using his penis. Mar, son of Ravina, says: He engaged in bestiality with his donkey. The one who says that he was a diviner by using his penis derives it as we stated. And the one who says that he engaged in bestiality with his donkey derives it as follows: It is written here: "He crouched, he lay down" (Numbers 24:9), and it is written there: "Between her legs 105b (1) he sunk, he fell, he lay" (Judges 5:27), which is interpreted as a reference to sexual intercourse between Sisera and Jael.
[in context this is really about Baalam]

Sanhedrin 107b (12) What is the incident involving Yehoshua ben Peraḥya? The Gemara relates: When King Yannai was killing the Sages, Yehoshua ben Peraḥya and Jesus, his student, went to Alexandria of Egypt. When there was peace between King Yannai and the Sages, Shimon ben Shataḥ sent a message to Yehoshua ben Peraḥya: From me, Jerusalem, the holy city, to you, Alexandria of Egypt: My sister, my husband is located among you and I sit desolate. The head of the Sages of Israel is out of the country and Jerusalem requires his return. (13) Yehoshua ben Peraḥya understood the message, arose, came, and happened to arrive at a certain inn on the way to Jerusalem. They treated him with great honor. Yehoshua ben Peraḥya said: How beautiful is this inn. Jesus, his student, said to him: But my teacher, the eyes of the innkeeper's wife are narrow [terutot]. Yehoshua ben Peraḥya said to him: Wicked one! Do you involve yourself with regard to that matter, the appearance of a married woman? He produced four hundred shofarot and ostracized him. (14) Jesus came before Yehoshua ben Peraḥya several times and said to him: Accept our, i.e., my, repentance. Yehoshua ben Peraḥya took no notice of him. One day Yehoshua ben Peraḥya was reciting Shema and Jesus came before him with the same request. Yehoshua ben Peraḥya intended to accept his request, and signaled him with his hand to wait until he completed his prayer. Jesus did not understand the signal and thought: He is driving me away. He went and stood a brick upright to serve as an idol and he bowed to it. Yehoshua ben Peraḥya then said to Jesus: Repent. Jesus said to him: This is the tradition that I received from you: Whoever sins and causes the masses to sin is not given the opportunity to repent. And the Master says: Jesus performed sorcery, incited Jews to engage in idolatry, and led Israel astray. Had Yehoshua ben Peraḥya not caused him to despair of atonement, he would not have taken the path of evil.

Bava Kama 113a (21) Rav Ashi said: The mishna issues its ruling with regard to a gentile customs collector, whom one may deceive, as it is taught in a baraita: In the case of a Jew and a gentile who approach the court for judgment in a legal dispute, if you can vindicate the Jew under Jewish law, vindicate him, and say to the gentile: This is our law. If he can be vindicated under gentile law, vindicate him, and say to the gentile: This is your law. And if it is not possible to vindicate him under either system of law, one approaches the case circuitously, seeking a justification to vindicate the Jew. This is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva disagrees and says: One does not approach the case circuitously in order to vindicate the Jew due to the sanctification of God's name, as God's name will be desecrated if the Jewish judge employs dishonest means. (22) The Gemara infers from this baraita: And even according to Rabbi Akiva, the reason that the court does not employ trickery in order to vindicate the Jew is only because there is the consideration of the sanctification of God's name. Consequently, if there is no consideration of the sanctification of God's name, the court does approach the case circuitously. Apparently, it is permitted to deceive a gentile.

Ketubot 11b (6) Rava said that this is what the mishna is saying: An adult man who engaged in intercourse with a minor girl less than three years old has done nothing, as intercourse with a girl less than three years old is tantamount to poking a finger into the eye. In the case of an eye, after a tear falls from it another tear forms to replace it. Similarly, the ruptured hymen of the girl younger than three is restored. And a young boy who engaged in intercourse with an adult woman renders her as one whose hymen was ruptured by wood. And with regard to the case of a woman whose hymen was ruptured by wood itself, there is a dispute between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis. Rabbi Meir maintains that her marriage contract is two hundred dinars, and the Rabbis maintain that it is one hundred dinars.

Ketubot 15b (8) And it is taught in the mishna: If there is a majority of Jews the baby is deemed a Jew. The Gemara asks: With regard to what halakha was this stated? Rav Pappa said: It was stated in order to return lost property to him, as one is required to return lost property to a Jew.

Gittin 57a (3) Onkelos then went and raised Jesus the Nazarene from the grave through necromancy. Onkelos said to him: Who is most important in that world where you are now? Jesus said to him: The Jewish people. Onkelos asked him: Should I then attach myself to them in this world? Jesus said to him: Their welfare you shall seek, their misfortune you shall not seek, for anyone who touches them is regarded as if he were touching the apple of his eye (see Zechariah 2:12). (4) Onkelos said to him: What is the punishment of that man, a euphemism for Jesus himself, in the next world? Jesus said to him: He is punished with boiling excrement. As the Master said: Anyone who mocks the words of the Sages will be sentenced to boiling excrement. And this was his sin, as he mocked the words of the Sages. The Gemara comments: Come and see the difference between the sinners of Israel and the prophets of the nations of the world. As Balaam, who was a prophet, wished Israel harm, whereas Jesus the Nazarene, who was a Jewish sinner, sought their well-being.

Baba Metzia 114b (2) As it is taught in a baraita: Rabbi Shimon ben Yoḥai says that the graves of gentiles do not render one impure, as it is stated: "And you, My sheep, the sheep of My pasture, are man" (Ezekiel 34:31), which teaches that you, i.e., the Jewish people, are called "man," but gentiles are not called "man." Since the Torah states with regard to ritual impurity imparted in a tent: "If a man dies in a tent" (Numbers 19:14), evidently impurity imparted by a tent does not apply to gentiles.

Shabbat 32b (6) Since the Gemara discussed the importance of the mitzva of ritual fringes, it cites that which Reish Lakish said: Anyone who is vigilant in performing the mitzva of ritual fringes merits that two thousand eight hundred servants will serve him in the World-to-Come. As it is stated: "Thus says the Lord of hosts: In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the corner of the garment of him that is a Jew, saying: We will go

with you, for we have heard that God is with you" (Zechariah 8:23). On each corner of a Jewish person's garment with ritual fringes, ten people from each of the seventy nations will take hold. That totals seven hundred people on each corner; 2,800 people altogether.

Shabbat 86b (4) Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the halakha with regard to semen of a Jew in the womb of a gentile woman? Do we say that since Jews are concerned about fulfilling mitzvot, due to that concern, their body temperature is hot and semen that is not absorbed becomes foul faster, in contrast to gentiles who are not concerned about fulfilling mitzvot for whom that is not the case? Or, perhaps, since gentiles eat detestable creatures and creeping animals their body temperature is also hot? And if you say that since they eat detestable creatures and creeping animals, their body temperature is hot, another dilemma can be raised: What is the halakha with regard to semen of a Jew in the womb of an animal? Do we say that in a woman, who has a long corridor [perozdor] to her womb, the semen becomes foul; but in an animal, which does not have as long a corridor, it does not? Or perhaps it is not different, and the period of time that the semen renders one ritually impure is the same in both cases? No resolution was found for these dilemmas. Therefore, let them stand unresolved.

Shabbat 116a (8) Apropos the scrolls of heretics, the Gemara analyzes the matter itself. With regard to the blank folios and the Torah scrolls of the heretics [minin in Hebrew, usually used of Christians], one does not rescue them from the fire. Rabbi Yosei says: During the week, one cuts the names of God contained therein and buries them, and burns the rest. Rabbi Tarfon said in the form of an oath: I will bury my sons if I fail to do the following, that if these books come into my possession I will burn them and the names contained therein. As even if a person is pursuing him with the intent to kill him, and a snake is hurrying to bite him, one enters a house of idolatry and does not enter the houses of these heretics. The reason is that these heretics are aware of the greatness of the Creator manifest in the Torah and its mitzvot, and nevertheless, they deny the existence of God; whereas these idolators are not aware, and that is the reason that they deny the existence of God. And with regard to the heretics, the verse says: "And behind the door and the doorpost you place your memory" (Isaiah 57:8). Although they remember the word of God, they treat it contemptuously, as if casting it behind the door. (9) Rabbi Yishmael said: The fact that the names of God in the scrolls of heretics may be burned can be derived through an a fortiori inference: Just as to make peace between a husband and his wife, the Torah says: My name that was written in sanctity shall be erased in the water in the framework of the ordeal of the sota; these, the heretics, who impose jealousy, and hatred, and conflict between the Jewish people and their Father in Heaven, all the more so it is proper to erase God's names because of them. And with regard to heretics, David said: "For I hate those who hate You, God, and I fight those who rise against You. I hate them with the utmost hatred, they have become enemies to me" (Psalms 139:21–22). And just as they, the scrolls of heretics, are not rescued from the fire, neither are they rescued from a rockslide, nor from water, nor from any other matter that destroys them.

Shevout 29a (9) With regard to the oath: If I did not see a camel flying through the air, Ravina said to Rav Ashi : Perhaps this man who took this oath saw a great bird and named it for himself: Camel, and when he took the oath, he took the oath according to his own understanding. (10) And if you would say that we follow his mouth, ie, the generally accepted meaning of what one says, and we do not follow his understanding, ie, his own private meaning, but isn't it taught otherwise in a baraita : When they administer an oath to him in court, the judges say to him: Know that it is not according to your own understanding that we administer this oath to you, but according to our understanding and according to the understanding of the court? What is the reason they say this? Is it not because we say: Perhaps he gave tokens [iskunderei] to his creditor but he calls them for himself: Dinars, so that when he takes the oath, it is according to his own understanding that he takes the oath. Since, in principle, it is possible for him to take an oath according to his private meaning of the words, the court insists that the oath it administers is to be understood according to the words' generally accepted meaning. (11) Rav Ashi replies: No, the reason the court admonishes the oath taker is not that the oath can be interpreted according to a private meaning. There, when the court administers an oath, they explain that it is according to their meaning due to deceptions like that of the reed in Rava 's court. In that incident, someone handed his creditor a hollow reed, which he had secretly filled with coins, to hold for him, and proceeded to take an oath that he had given him the money owed to him, whereupon he took back the reed, as the creditor was unaware of its contents. The court admonishes oath takers so that they do not think that they have fulfilled their obligation to take an oath if they engage in such chicanery. (12) The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a baraita : And so we found that when Moses administered an oath to Israel that they would keep the Torah (see Deuteronomy 29:9–12), he said to them: Know that I am not administering this oath according to your understanding but according to the understanding of the Omnipresent and according to my understanding. And why not let him simply say to them: Keep that which God said? Is it not that he insisted on admonishing them because he was concerned lest they direct the oath in their minds to idolatry, saying that they are taking an oath of loyalty to God but privately intending the oath to be for idolatry? This indicates that the content of an oath can be affected by an oath taker's private meaning. (13) The Gemara rejects this: No, Moses explicitly indicated that the oath was according to God's and his own understanding because idolatry is also referred to with the word: God, as it is written: "You shall not make with Me gods of silver or gods of gold" (Exodus 20:20). Therefore, the generally accepted meaning of the oath is ambiguous. (14) The Gemara suggests: If private meanings do not affect the content of an oath, let Moses merely say to them: Keep the Torah. The Gemara explains: They could then have taken an oath to keep only one Torah, either the Written or the Oral Torah. The Gemara suggests: And let him say: Keep two Torahs. The Gemara explains: The word: Torah, also has a narrower meaning of a set of halakhic procedures. The Jewish people could then have limited the oath to the law of [torat] the sin-offering or the law of [torat] the guilt-offering. The Gemara suggests: Let Moses administer an oath to keep the entire Torah. The Gemara replies: That could have been understood as referring only to the prohibition of idolatry, as the Master says: The prohibition of idolatry is so severe that with regard to one who denies idol worship, it is as if he affirms the entire Torah. [it keeps going like this but the gist is not necessarily approving of these things but describes why they formulate their oaths in Jewish courts the way they do].

Nedarim 23b one who desires that his vows not be upheld for the entire year should stand up on Rosh HaShana and say: Any vow that I take in the future should be void. And this statement is effective, provided that he remembers at the time of the vow that his intent at the beginning of the year was to render it void.

Avodah Zarah 22a (1) MISHNA: One may not keep an animal in the inns [befundekaot] of gentiles because they are suspected of bestiality. Since even gentiles are prohibited from engaging in bestiality, a Jew who places his animal there is guilty of violating the prohibition: “You shall not put a stumbling block before the blind” (Leviticus 19:14). And a woman may not seclude herself with gentiles because they are suspected of engaging in forbidden sexual relations. And any person may not seclude himself with gentiles because they are suspected of bloodshed.

Avodah Zarah 22b (11) And if you wish, say instead: Even when he finds the wife, he also engages in bestiality with the animal, as the Master said: The animal of a Jew is more appealing to gentiles than their own wives, as Rabbi Yoḥanan says: At the time when the snake came upon Eve, at the time of the sin of her eating from the Tree of Knowledge, it infected her with moral contamination, and this contamination lingers in all human beings. The Gemara asks: If that is so, a Jew should also be suspected of engaging in bestiality. The Gemara answers: With regard to the Jewish people, who stood at Mount Sinai and received the Torah, their contamination ended, whereas in the case of gentiles, who did not stand at Mount Sinai and receive the Torah, their contamination has not ended.

Avodah Zarah 26a (16) Abaye said to him: It is prohibited to raise a gentile from a pit even in exchange for payment, because one can say an excuse to him, such as: My son is standing on the roof and I must go use this ladder to help him down from the roof. Alternatively, he can say to him: A time has been appointed for me to appear in the courthouse [bei davar] and I must attend to this matter. Since the Jew can provide a legitimate excuse for refusing to help the gentile, there is no need to extract him from the pit. (17) Apropos the notion of raising someone from or lowering him into a pit, the Gemara notes that Rabbi Abbahu taught the following while standing before Rabbi Yoḥanan : With regard to gentiles and shepherds of domesticated animals, one may not raise them from a pit,

Avodah Zarah 36b (2) The Gemara discusses the matter itself: Balei says that Avimi of Nota says in the name of Rav: The prohibitions with regard to gentiles’ bread and their oil, their wine and their daughters, are all from the eighteen matters issued in a single day in the time of the students of Shammai and Hillel. The Gemara asks: With regard to their daughters, what is the decree? Rabbi Nahman bar Yitzhak says: They decreed upon their daughters that they should be classified as menstruating women from the time they are in their cradle, i.e., they decreed that from when they are young, gentile women are always considered to be menstruating.

Avodah Zarah 37a 1-2 Since a nine-year-old boy is fit to engage in intercourse, he also imparts ritual impurity as one who experienced ziva (ghonnoea like discharge). Ravina said: Therefore, with regard to a female gentile child who is three years and one day old, since she is fit to engage in intercourse at that age, she also imparts impurity as one who experienced ziva. The Gemara asks: Isn’t that obvious? The Gemara explains: It was necessary to state this ruling, lest you say that the halakha that a gentile who is suited for intercourse imparts impurity does not apply to a female. The possible difference between a male and female child is based on the fact that whereas that child, a nine-year-old male gentile, knows how to accustom others to sin by employing persuasion, this child, a three-year-old female gentile, does not know how to accustom others to sin until she matures. Therefore, Ravina teaches us that the halakha nevertheless applies to both male and female children.)

Kiddushin 21b (17) Similarly, a dilemma was raised before them: What is the halakha with regard to the permissibility for a priest who goes to war to engage in intercourse with a beautiful woman captured in that war? Does one say that the case of a beautiful woman is a novelty in that the Torah permits a man to engage in intercourse with a gentile woman? Consequently, it is no different in the case of a priest and no different in the case of an Israelite, as both are permitted to engage in intercourse with this woman. Or perhaps the case of priests is different, since the Torah includes additional mitzvot for them? Rav said: It is permitted, and Shmuel said: It is prohibited. (18) The Gemara comments: With regard to the first act of sexual intercourse between the soldier priest and the gentile woman, everyone agrees that it is permitted, as the Torah spoke only in response to the evil inclination, and the evil inclination of a priest is as strong as that of an Israelite. This passage serves to prevent intercourse performed in a prohibited manner, which is relevant to a priest as well. (19) When they disagree it is with regard to the second act of sexual intercourse. Is a priest permitted to bring the captive into his house, convert her, and marry her? Rav said it is permitted, and Shmuel said it is prohibited. Their reasoning is as follows: Rav said it is permitted: Since she was permitted to him once, she remains permitted to him. And Shmuel said it is prohibited, as ultimately she is a convert, and a convert is not fit to marry a priest.

Kiddushin 40a (16) Rabbi Abbahu says in the name of Rabbi Ḥanina: It is preferable for a person to transgress in secret and not to desecrate the name of Heaven in public [befarhesya], as it is stated: “As for you, house of Israel, so says the Lord God: Go you, serve everyone his idols, even because you will not hearken to Me, but My sacred name you shall not profane” (Ezekiel 20:39). (17) Rabbi Ilai the Elder says: If a person sees that his evil inclination is overcoming him, he should go to a place where he is not known, and wear black clothes, and he should cover himself in simple black garments, and he should do as his heart desires, but he should not desecrate the name of Heaven in public (18) The Gemara asks: Is that so? But isn’t it taught in a baraita: With regard to anyone who does not care about his Creator’s honor, it is fitting for him not to have come into the world. What is this? Who is considered to be one who does not care about his Creator’s honor? Rabba says: This is one who gazes at a rainbow, which is described as: “The likeness of the glory of the Lord” (Ezekiel 1:28). Rav Yosef says: This is one who transgresses in secret, which shows that he fears other people but does not care about the honor of his Creator. (19) The Gemara answers: This is not difficult, as this source, which says that one who transgresses in secret does not care about his Creator’s honor, is referring to one who can overcome

his evil inclination but nevertheless chooses to transgress in secret. And that source, which states that it is preferable for him to transgress in secret, is referring to one who cannot overcome his evil inclination.

Tractate Soferim 15 (5) R. Simeon b. Yoḥai taught: He who occupies himself with [only the study of] Scripture indulges in an indifferent practice; with Mishnah it is a practice for which a reward is conferred; as for one who occupies himself with Shas, there is no worthier practice, provided he had first studied Scripture and Mishnah. (6) Always run to the Mishnah more than to the Shas. R. Jose b. Abin said: [The preceding Rule only applies to the time] before Rabbi had edited the Mishnayoth, but now that Rabbi has edited the Mishnayoth run to the Mishnah more than to the Shas. (7) [The Sages], however, said: Scripture has been compared to water, the Mishnah to wine, and the Shas to spiced-wine. The world cannot exist without water, it cannot exist without wine, and it cannot exist without spiced-wine; but a rich man enjoys all three of them. So, too, it is impossible for the world to exist without Scripture and without Mishnah, but it can never exist without the Shas. [shas= the six orders of the Talmud]

Tractate Soferim 15 (10) Abba Gurion of Zadian said in the name of Abba Guria: A man should not teach his son to be an ass-driver, sailor, waggoner, shepherd or shopkeeper, because their occupations are robbery. R. Judah, however, quoting him, said: Ass-drivers are mostly wicked, but sailors are mostly pious. The best of physicians are [destined] for Gehinnom and the most worthy of butchers is Amalek's partner. Bastards are mostly keen-witted, slaves are mostly arrogant, the children of reputed parents are mostly bashful, and children usually resemble the mother's brother. R. Simeon b. Yoḥai taught: Kill the best of the heathens in time of war; crush the brain of the best of serpents. The most worthy of women indulges in witchcraft. Happy is he who does the will of the Omnipresent.

Yevamot 57b (1) There is significance to a priest entering a wedding canopy with women who are unfit to marry a priest. If a priest's daughter who is unfit to marry a priest enters the wedding canopy with a priest, she becomes disqualified from partaking of teruma from her father's household. This is the case even if the priest did not betroth her and they did not engage in sexual intercourse. And Shmuel said: There is no significance to a priest entering the wedding canopy with women who are unfit to marry a priest. Only sexual intercourse disqualifies her from the privileges of priesthood. (2) Shmuel said: And Abba, i.e., Rav, whose first name was Abba, concedes to me, with regard to a girl less than three years and one day old, that she is not disqualified by merely entering the wedding canopy. Since there is no legal significance to an act of intercourse with her, there is no legal significance to entering the wedding canopy with her. (3) Rava said: We, too, learn in the following baraita that there is no legal significance to an act of intercourse with a girl less than three years old: A girl three years and one day old can be betrothed via sexual intercourse; and if she was a yevama and her yavam had intercourse with her, he has acquired her; and a man who has intercourse with her while she is married to someone else is liable on her account because of the prohibition of intercourse with a married woman; and if she experiences a menstrual discharge she renders ritually impure a man who has intercourse with her, so that he renders impure the object upon which he lies like the upper one.

Yevamot 98a (2) Rava said: With regard to that which the Sages said, that a gentile has no patrilineage, do not say that it is because they are so steeped in licentiousness that they do not know the identity of their fathers with certainty, but if that identity is known, we are concerned that the paternity is recognized, with regard to the prohibition of intercourse with forbidden paternal relatives and other halakhic issues. Rather, even when it is known, we are still not concerned. (3) The proof is from the case of two identical twin brothers, who were one drop that was divided into two and obviously have the same father, and yet it is taught in the latter clause of the baraita: They do not perform ḥalitza and they do not perform levirate marriage, although they certainly have the same father. Learn from this that the Merciful One dispossesses the male gentile of his offspring, as it is written with regard to Egyptians: "Whose flesh is the flesh of donkeys, and whose semen is the semen of horses" (Ezekiel 23:20), i.e., the offspring of a male gentile is considered no more related to him than the offspring of donkeys and horses.

[that last part, after the semen of horses, is NOT in the Hebrew nor in the German translation] (German trans: Two twin brothers come from a drop that has been divided, but in the final sentence he teaches that they do not have to perform the Ḥaliṭṭah and the marriage of brothers-in-law. Conclude from this that the All-Merciful has declared their seed to be free, as it is said: whose flesh is like the flesh of an ass, and their semen is like that of a horse.)

Jerusalem Talmud (Guggenheimer trans.) Kiddishin 4:12 (1) Rabbi Simeon ben Yoḥai stated: Kill the best of Gentiles, smash the head of the best of snakes; the best qualified among women is a sorceress. Blessed is he who does the will of the Omnipresent.

Eruvin 21b (8) Rava expounded another verse in similar fashion: What is the meaning of that which is written: "And more than these, my son, be careful: of making many books [sefarim] there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh" (Ecclesiastes 12:12)? My son, be careful to fulfill the words of the Sages [soferim] even more than the words of the Torah. For the words of the Torah include positive and negative commandments, and even with regard to the negative commandments, the violation of many of them is punishable only by lashes. Whereas with respect to the words of the Sages, anyone who transgresses the words of the Sages is liable to receive the death penalty, as it is stated: "And whoever breaches through a hedge, a snake shall bite him" (Ecclesiastes 10:8), taking hedges to refer metaphorically to decrees. (9) Lest you say: If the words of the Sages are of substance and have such great importance, why were they not written in the Torah, therefore, the verse states: "Of making many books there is no end," meaning that it is impossible to fully commit the Oral Torah to writing, as it is boundless. (10) What is the meaning of the words: "And much study [lahag] is a weariness of the flesh"? Rav Pappa, son of Rav Aḥa bar Adda, said in the name of Rav Aḥa bar Ulla: This teaches that whoever mocks [malig] the words of the Sages will be sentenced to boiling excrement, which results from the weariness of the flesh of man.

NON TALMUDIC WORKS

Midrash Mekhilta DeRabbi Yishmael (trans Shraga Silverstein) [An early third-century midrashic collection from the land of Israel from the school of Rabbi Yishmael.]

Tractate Vayehi Beshalach 2 (28) (Exodus 14:7) "And he took six hundred choice chariots": Whence came the horses required for the chariots? If you would say, from Egypt, is it not written (re the plague of pestilence, Ibid. 9:6) "and all the cattle of Egypt died"? And if you would say, from Pharaoh, is it not written (Ibid. 3) "Behold, the hand of the L-rd is in your cattle in the field, in the horses, etc."? And if you say, from Israel, is it not written (Ibid. 10:26) "And our cattle, too, will go with us; not a hoof will remain"? Whence, then, did they come? From those (of his servants) who feared the word of the L-rd (viz. 9:20) and drove his horses from the field into the houses. We find, then, that the cattle driven off by those who feared the word of the L-rd proved to be an impediment to Israel — whence R. Shimon says: "the best of the gentiles — kill! The best of the serpents — crush its head!" [interestingly the apologists say the context of this is in war time but the Israelites were not at war with Egypt, they were fleeing Egypt. Even if it is in the context of war, it is saying to commit genocide since even the civilians and innocent will help the enemy if you don't kill them]

Mishnah Torah trans Eliyahu Touger [Mishnah Torah, also known as the code of Maimonides/Rambam, also referred to as Yad HaChazakah ("The Strong Hand"), is a monumental legal code and one of the most organized, comprehensive, and influential works of Jewish law. Written over a period of ten years, the work systematically categorizes and clearly explains all aspects of Jewish observance, including those applicable only in Temple times.]

Mishnah Torah Sefer Kedushah Forbidden Intercourse 12 (10) If, by contrast, a Jewish male enters into relations with a gentile woman, when he does so intentionally, she should be executed. She is executed because she caused a Jew to be involved in an unseemly transgression, as [is the law with regard to] an animal. [This applies regardless of] whether the gentile woman was a minor of three years of age, or an adult, whether she was single or married. And it applies even if [the Jew] was a minor of nine years old, [she is executed]. This [punishment] is explicitly mentioned in the Torah, as [Numbers 31:16-17] states: "Behold they were [involved] with the children of Israel according to the advice of Balaam .Execute any woman fit to know a man through lying with a male."

Mishnah Torah Sefer Mada, Foreign Worship and Customs of the Nations (Hilkhoth Akum?) 5(1) A person who proselytizes [a mesit] to any single Jew [a musat] - whether man or woman - on behalf of false deities should be stoned to death. [This applies] even if neither the mesit or the musat actually worshiped the false deity. As long as he instructed him to worship [the false deity], he should be executed by stoning, regardless of whether the mesit was a prophet or an ordinary person, or whether the musat was a single individual - man or woman - or whether several people were proselytized. (4-5) It is a mitzvah for the musat to kill [the mesit], as [Deuteronomy 13:10] states: "Your hand must be the first against him to kill him." It is forbidden for the musat to love the mesit , as [the previous verse states]: "Do not be attracted to him." Since [Exodus 23:5] states with regard to an enemy: "You must surely help him," [the question arises:] Perhaps you should help a mesit? The Torah [Deuteronomy, ibid.] teaches, "Do not... listen to him." Since [Leviticus 19:16] teaches: "Do not stand idly over your brother's blood," [the question arises:] Perhaps you should not stand idly over a mesit's blood? The Torah teaches, [Deuteronomy, ibid.] "Do not let your eyes pity him." The musat is forbidden to advance any arguments on his behalf, as [the verse continues,] "Do not show him any compassion." If he knows incriminating evidence, he is not permitted to remain silent, as [the verse continues,] "Do not try to cover up for him." What is the verse which serves as a warning against a common person proselytizing as a misit ? "And all Israel will hear and they will become afraid [and they will not continue to do such evil things]" (Deuteronomy 13:12 .

Mishnah Torah Sefer Mada, Foreign Worship and Customs of the Nations (Hilkhoth Akum?) 10 (1) Accordingly, if we see an idolater being swept away or drowning in the river, we should not help him. If we see that his life is in danger, we should not save him. It is, however, forbidden to cause one of them to sink or push him into a pit or the like, since he is not waging war against us. To whom do the above apply? To gentiles. It is a mitzvah, however, to eradicate Jewish traitors, minim , and apikorsim , and to cause them to descend to the pit of destruction, since they cause difficulty to the Jews and sway the people away from God. (2) From the above, we can infer that it is forbidden to offer medical treatment to an idolater even when offered a wage. If, however, one is afraid of the consequences or fears that ill feeling will be aroused, one may treat them for a wage, but to treat them for free is forbidden.

Mishnah Torah Sefer Nezikim, Murderer and the Preservation of Life 4:12 It is a mitzvah tokill minim and apikorsim . The term minim refers to Jewish idolaters or those who perform transgressions for the sake of angering God, even if one eats non-kosher meat for the sake of angering God or wears sha'atnez for the sake of angering God. The term apikorsim refers to Jews who deny the Torah and the concept of prophecy. If there is the possibility, one should kill them with a sword in public view. If that is not possible, one should develop a plan so that one can cause their deaths. What is implied? If one sees such a person descend to a cistern, and there is a ladder in the cistern, one should take the ladder, and excuse oneself, saying: "I must hurry to take my son down from the roof. I shall return the ladder to you soon." Similarly, one should devise other analogous plans to cause the death of such people. With regard to a gentile idolater with whom we are not at war, a Jewish shepherd of small livestock, and the like, by contrast, we should not try to cause their deaths. It is, however, forbidden to save their lives if their lives are threatened. For example, if such a person falls into the sea, one should not rescue him. Leviticus 19:16] states: "Do not stand idly by while your brother's blood is at stake." This does not apply with regard to such individuals, because they are not "your brothers."

Rabbeinu Bahya,[A commentary on the Torah written by Rabbi Bachya ben Asher (1255–1340) in Spain. Rabbeinu Bachya's commentary incorporates the literal meaning along with allegorical, midrashic, and kabbalistic interpretations.] (Trans Eliyahu Munk)

Rabbeinu Bahya, Shemot 20:13 (2) - Please note that the Torah does not write "against your brother," as it does when forbidding charging interest, (Deut. 23,20) or when it commands you to return found property (Deut. 22,3), or in similar legislation . In all those instances our sages explain the word brother as excluding non-Jews. In other words, while it is forbidden to charge (or pay)

interest to a Jew, it is not forbidden to charge interest to a Gentile. While one must go out of one's way to restore lost property owned by a Jew, there is no legal obligation to spend time, energy, and even money to restore lost property to a Gentile. Here is the reason the Torah fails to limit the legislation to your brother. It is clear that one must not bear false testimony against a Gentile, ie against Egyptians.

Rabbeinu Bahya, Devarim 22:1 All our sages are agreed that the commandment to restore lost property applies only to property belonging to Jews, not to that belonging to Gentiles. This is why the Torah stresses repeatedly “,lost property of your brother,” and “restore it to your brother.” Gentiles are perceived as part and parcel of ,part of the alien deities of “earth,” a system of life which does not know of an hereafter or resurrection, etc.

THE KABBALAH

Zohar (III:282) Ki Teitzei 25:123. Her mistress is a garden. The handmaid is filthy refuse from the aspect of the mixed multitude. The refuse is mixed in the garden in order to grow seeds of the aspect of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. From the aspect of idolatry THE HANDMAID is called Saturn, Lilit, filthy refuse, because she is excrement mixed with different types of filth and vermin, into which dead dogs are thrown. The children of Esau and Ishmael are buried in it. She is a grave for idolatry, where the uncircumcised are buried, who are dead dogs, vermin, a bad smell and filthy, and who became foul through her, who is the adhesion attached to the mixed multitude that are mixed in Yisrael, and who is attached to the bones and flesh that are the children of Esau and Ishmael, who are a dead bone and unclean meat, meat that is torn by beasts in the field, of which it says, "you shall cast it to the dogs" (Shemot 22:30). [not even in code could this be about Jesus, the text is strange stuff about the moon and stars]

Shaarei Orah/Sefer HaOrah, Fifth Gate, Sixth Sefirah

(128) Now, the meaning of the words “they will lick the dust of your feet,” is one of the secrets of our faith. Know, that all blessings first come from HaShem ,blessed is He, to the Ingathering of Israel-Knesset Yisroel (Shechinah). From the Ingathering of Israel-Knesset Yisroel (Shechinah) they come to the Jewish people, and from the Jewish people, the seventy nations who serve false gods are sustained below. This is as stated, “And by you all the families of the earth shall be blessed.” However, when the Jewish people sinned and broke the conduits, the nations of the world inherited the blessing and beneficence leaking from those conduits, that was meant for the Jewish people, as it states, “Because of a slave who reigns.” This is because those hard external husks of Kelipah have entered to obstruct between HaShem ,blessed is He, and the Jewish people. However, “When HaShem will return the captivity of Zion,” and HaShem and the Jewish people will be unified, all intermediaries between them will be removed. In that time, not a single minister of the nations will receive any beneficence, blessing, or goodness, whatsoever, except through the Ingathering of Israel-Knesset Yisroel (Shechinah) that will overpower and rule over them all, providing them with their sustenance. All the ministers and nations who serve false gods will only receive their sustenance from what remains at the lowest end of all levels, from the residue of the Ingathering of Israel-Knesset Yisroel (Shechinah). This is the secret of the words, “They will lick the dust of your feet.” In that time, all the ministering angels will be subservient to the Jewish people, and all their sustenance will be received through the Jewish people. This is the secret of the verse, “It will happen that ten men of all the [seventy] languages of the nations, will take hold of the corner of the garment of a Jew, saying, ‘Let us go with you, for we have heard that God-Elohim is with you!’”

(129) You have thus learned that when the Name HaShem, blessed is He, will be unified with the Ingathering of Israel-Knesset Yisroel (Shechinah) and they will become unified as one, all of the supernal ministering angels will join in solidarity to serve HaShem and the Jewish people, since all their sustenance will come through them. Now, in that time, just as the desire and yearning of the seventy supernal ministering angels will be to serve the Ingathering of Israel-Knesset Yisroel (Shechinah), so likewise, the yearning and desire of their seventy nations below will be to serve and adhere to the Jewish people, and they all will serve the Name HaShem ,blessed is He. This is the secret of the verse, “I then will transform the nations to [speak] a pure language, so that they will all proclaim the Name HaShem ,to serve Him with united resolve.” This also is the secret of the verse, “It will happen in the end of days: The mountain of the Temple of HaShem will be firmly established as the head of the mountains and will be above the hills, and all the nations will stream to it. Many peoples will go and say, ‘Come, let us go up to the Mountain of HaShem ,to the Temple of the God of Yaakov, and He will teach us His ways and we will walk in His paths. For Torah will come forth from Zion, and the word of HaShem from Jerusalem.”

SHULCHAN ARUCH

The Shulchan Arukh (“Set Table”) is the most widely accepted code of Jewish law ever written. Compiled in the 16th century by Rabbi Yosef Karo, it is a condensed and simplified version of the Beit Yosef, a commentary that Karo wrote on the Tur. Karo’s rulings are in accordance with Sephardic traditions; the text of the Shulchan Arukh also includes the glosses of Rabbi Moshe Isserles, which cite Ashkenazic traditions.

Yoreh De’ah 158 (Sefaria community translation) Idol worshipers, with whom there is no war with us, and Jewish shepherds of thin animals [“behemah dakah” - a category of animals, including sheep and rams, which one is forbidden to raise in the Land of Israel due to the fact that they consume every creature in their way, thus hindering the mitzvah of settling the Land -translator’s note] in the Land of Israel, at a time when most of the fields belong to Jews, and [consequent laws that] derive from this [apply] , one may not allow the [idol worshipers] to die, but it is forbidden to save them if [the rescuer] is likely to die [trying to save them], such as [a case where one] saw one of them who fell into the sea, one does not pull him out even if he will be paid. Thus, one must not heal them, even for payment, unless there is reason [to save them] on the grounds of [preventing] hatred [of Jews]. Rema: for then [under those circumstances] it is permitted even for free [without payment] to save them, if he will not be able to be dropped even for free. (Beit Yosef in the name of the Ramban). And thus it is (Rema: it would be) permitted to attempt to heal a Cutite [non-Jew] if one is so inclined (Tosfot and the Mordechai Pe”m and in the Sma”g). Which things are being discussed, regarding a Jew with sins and who stands by his wickedness consistently, such as the shepherd of a thin animal [behemah dakah] who unloads stolen wares [“parku b’gazel] and they go in their foolish ways. But a Jew who has sins, [but] who does not stand by his wickedness consistently, [and]

rather does sins for personal benefit, such as one who eats forbidden foods to satisfy his appetite, it's a mitzvah to save him and it's forbidden to let him die (literally: stand by his blood).

Chosen Mishpat (also Hamishpat, ha = Hebrew definite article) fourth book of the Shulhan Aruch (wiki source translation)

Chosen Mishpat 156 Paragraph 5- If one has a business arrangement with a gentile, there are those places that rule that others are prohibited from interfering with his livelihood and doing business with that gentile, and there are some places that do not rule that way. There are those who permit another Jew to go to that gentile to lend him, do business with him, bribe him and take property from him because a gentile's property is considered ownerless. There are those who prohibit it. Even where a Jew regularly does work with a gentile, it would be prohibited for another Jew to compete and do the work at a cheaper price. If he wants to do it, we would rebuke him. Nevertheless, if he violated and did the work we would not remove the money from him. See later Siman 227. If two individuals live together and one wants to lend with interest to a gentile, the other cannot object. The same applies to anything similar. See later 228:18

Chosen Mishpat 227 Paragraph 1- One is prohibited from overcharging another, whether in buying or selling. Whichever party overcharges, regardless of whether it is the seller or buyer, violates a negative commandment....Paragraph 26- A gentile has no claim of overcharge, as the verse states, "a man to his brother..." If a gentile overcharged a Jew, he would return the overcharge under our laws so that the rules of a gentile not be more strict than that of a Jew.

Chosen Mishpat 348 paragraph 2- Anyone who steals violates the prohibition of "do not steal," even if it just a perutah, and would be obligated to pay back. This applies regardless of whether he stole the money of a Jew or the money of a gentile and whether he stole from an adult or a minor. Misleading an idolater, such as misleading him in the accounting or avoiding repaying his loan, is permitted so long as he doesn't know so that there is no desecration of God's name. There are those who say one is prohibited from misleading him and only if the idolater made the mistake on his own would it be permitted.

Chosen Mishpat 388 paragraph 9- One is prohibited from handing over a Jew to an idolater, whether it's the Jew's physical person or his money, even if he was wicked and a sinner and even if he caused him pain and suffering. This is only where he caused him pain with mere words. If he informed, however, the victim may inform on him, because legally he may kill him in a situation where there is a concern he may inform again or where there is no other way for him to rescue himself. If there is another way to rescue himself, however, it is like two individuals who each informed on each other and whomever caused the greater loss would pay the full amount of the difference. Whomever informs on a Jew to an idolater, whether it is his person or his money, receives no share in the next world. Paragraph 10- One is permitted to kill an informer in all places, even today. One is permitted to kill him before he informs. As soon as he says he is going to inform on so and so's person or money, even if it is a small amount of money, he has given himself up to be killed. We would warn him and say do not inform. If he is brazen and says he still plans on informing, there is a mitzvah to kill him. Whomever kills him first would receive the merit. If there is no time to kill him, no warning is necessary. There are those who say that one cannot kill an informer unless it is impossible to rescue the victim with one of the informer's limbs. If it is possible to rescue with of his limbs, however, such as by cutting off his tongue or blinding his eyes, one is prohibited from killing him because is no worse than any other pursuer. [informer/Moser from Jewish encyclopaedia: An informer, denunciator, or delator; synonyms are "masor" (abstract, "mesirah"), "delator" [one who indicates to a court another as having committed a punishable deed.]... Nothing was more severely punished by the Jews than talebearing; and no one was held in greater contempt than the informer. On account of the fact that his deeds frequently caused mischief and even entailed death and destruction, the sages of the Talmud compared the "moser" to a serpent. In Talmudic Times- The Jews suffered much during the persecutions under Hadrian through informers in their own ranks; especially teachers of the Law were betrayed by the delators. Simeon ben Yoḥai, having criticized the Roman government, was denounced; and he saved his life only by hasty flight. A certain Eleazar b. Simon is said to have denounced to the Romans Jews who were engaged in freebooting expeditions against them. According to Talmudic law, the delator was punished with death; and although in general the jurisdiction of the Jewish courts in criminal cases ceased with the destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, in the case of informers the penalty remained in force, those convicted being punished the more severely because they deliberately increased the danger which constantly threatened the people.]

Chosen Mishpat 425

TOSEFTA

(The Tosefta is something of a mystery. Strack and Stemberger describe it as a book of "additional halakhic teaching[s] which supplement M[i]shnah" (in the wider sense as the officially taught halakhah)." Neusner calls the Tosefta "the Mishnah's first commentary, first amplification, and first extension...the first talmud." However, the relationship of the Mishnah and the Tosefta is more complex than these definitions suggest. And though both Talmuds appear to "read Mishnah passages through Tosefta complements to the Mishnah," according to Neusner, making Tosefta a bridge between a great deal of the Mishnah and the later texts, there is also much uncertainty about their relationship.)

Tosefta Avodah Zarah 9:4 (Sefaria Community Translation)

The sons of Noach were given seven commandments: courts, idolatry, [blasphemy,] forbidden sexual relations, bloodshed, theft, and [consuming] the limb of a living animal. Justice, how so? Just as Jews are commanded to set up courts in their cities, so too are the sons of Noach commanded to set up courts in their cities. Idolatry and blasphemy, how so? The sons of Noach are executed only with the sword. Forbidden sexual relations, how so? Any prohibited sexual relation that a Jewish court would inflict capital punishment, the sons of Noach are forbidden [from doing so]. And every prohibited sexual relation that a Jewish court would prohibit, the sons of Noach are put to death on their account according to Rabbi Meir. But the Sages say, there are many forbidden sexual relations on account of which a court would not inflict capital punishment and about which the sons of Noach are not warned. For engaging in a forbidden sexual relationship, a Jew is judged according to the Jewish law and idolators are judged by the law of idolators. I have only the prohibition on a young woman alone. Bloodshed, how so? An idolator [who kills] an idolator or an idolator who kills a Jew are liable. A Jew [who kills] an idolator is exempt. Theft, how so? One who stole or robbed or [took] a female war captive and so on, an idolator [who did so to] an idolator or an idolator [who did so] to a Jew, it is prohibited. A Jew [who did so]

to an idolator, it is permitted. [Eating] from the limb of a living animal, how so? A limb loosely connected to an animal and it is not brought up [enough] for healing is prohibited for a son of Noach and one needn't even mention a Jew. And if it is brought up enough for healing, it is permitted to a Jew, and one needn't even mention a son of Noach. If one took a bird which is not an olive's-bulk and ate it, Rabbi would exempt him and Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon would obligate him. And if the limb of it makes someone liable, shouldn't the whole of it make someone liable? If one strangled it and ate it, he is exempt. Rabbi Hananya ben Gamliel said, on account of blood from a living animal. Rabbi Hidqa says, on account of castration. Rabbi Shimon says, on account of sorcery. Rabbi Yosei says, all that is said in the parsha of the sons of Noach they are warned, as it says, "Let no one be found among you who consigns a son or daughter to the fire . . . one who casts spells . . . for anyone who does so is abhorrent to God" (Deut 18:10-12). Is it possible that scripture has subjected [one to punishment] without forewarning? Rather it warns and after that subjects [one to punishment]. This teaches that it warns first and after that subjects [one to punishment]. Rabbi Elazar says, all kilayim are permitted to the sons of Noach to sow or to wear kilayim. It is prohibited to breed [mixed animals] or graft trees. [technically the idolator is "star worker/akum, not goyim, but admitted to generally apply to all goyim]

Tosefta Avodah Zarah 9:4 (Jacob Neusner edition, which has it at 8:4, available on Archive.org)

8:4 A. Concerning seven religious requirements were the children of Noah admonished:

B. setting up courts of justice, idolatry, blasphemy [cursing the Name of God], fornication, bloodshed, and thievery.

C. Concerning setting up courts of justice - how so?

D. Just as Israelites are commanded to call into session in their towns courts of justice.

E. Concerning idolatry and blasphemy —how so? ...

F. Concerning fornication - how so?

G. "On account of any form of prohibited sexual relationship on account of which an Israelite court inflicts the death-penalty, the children of Noah are subject to warning," the words of R. Meir.

H. And sages say, "There are many prohibited relationships, on account of which an Israelite court does not inflict the death-penalty and the children of Noah are [not] warned. In regard to these forbidden relationships the nations are judged in accord with the laws governing the nations.

I. "And you have only the prohibitions of sexual relations with a betrothed maiden alone."

8:5 A. For bloodshed — how so?

B. A gentile [who kills] a gentile and a gentile who kills an Israelite are liable, An Israelite [who kills] a gentile is exempt.

C. Concerning thievery?

D. [If] one has stolen, or robbed, and so too in the case of finding a beautiful captive [woman], and in similar cases:

E. a gentile in regard to a gentile, or a gentile in regard to an Israelite — it is prohibited. And an Israelite in regard to a gentile - it is permitted.

Tosefta Eruvim (Jacob Neusner trans he added the bit about "for the purposes..." it's not in the Hebrew) 5 (19)

A A courtyard inhabited by gentiles –

B lo, [for the purposes of carrying on the Sabbath] it is the equivalent of a cattle-pen.

C It is permitted to bring something in and to take something out from the courtyard to the houses which open onto it, [the Hebrew uses the word for settlement/town and not courtyard and cattle pen is literally "dwelling belonging to cattle" in Hebrew]

UNKNOWN AND UNSUBSTANTIATED

Seph. Jp. 92 1

Gad Shas 2:2

Shaalot U'Teshuvot- this is a style of questions and answers from rabbis. As the Jewish encyclopaedia says- "The Hebrew designation for the "responsa prudentium," connoting the written decisions and rulings given by eminent rabbis, teachers, or heads of academies to questions addressed to them in writing. These responsa constitute a special class of Talmudic and rabbinical literature, which in form differs both from the commentaries and from the codifications of rabbinical Judaism, yet in content is similar to both."

Yoreh De'ah (Jore Dia) is a book of the Shulhan Aruch. Apparently Moses Sofer wrote the Shaalot in question Sefer Hatan sofer : helek Yoreh de'ah ... teshuvot she'elot

Midrash Talpiot 225 L

Libbre David

NOTE: MOST OF THESE TRANSLATIONS ARE AVAILABLE AT WWW.SEFARIA.ORG exceptions are the Neusner translation of the Tosefta Avodah Zarah and portions of the Shulhan Aruch, though all are readily available online